

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Status Report on an Evaluation Panel for Courses on the Analytical Process

FROM:

ATB/TTD  
926 C of C

EXTENSION

NO.

TE

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

C/IT

ADC/OTE  
1025 C of C

DDT

Re our Wednesday evening discussion: I addressed the status report on the evaluation panel to you. If it looks about right, you can hand it to Gates on Monday. Since the memo is on the machine, we can make any changes you suggest.

3-4. Bob -

Per our conversation.

Any ideas would be  
welcome. Pls

Indicate your candidates  
(Secretaries) for the  
DDT panels. Thanks.

26 April 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director Designate, Office of Training and Education

25X1 FROM:   
Analysis Training Branch/IT

SUBJECT: Status Report on an Evaluation Panel for Courses on the Analytical Process

1. I am in the process of merging plans for the one-day review conference on the OTE curriculum regarding the process of analysis with your proposal to establish an evaluation panel.

2. The original plan was to elicit a one-shot critical review from a group of outside authorities and DI managers. What are the challenges to effective analysis and the recommended correctives that should undergird the curriculum and drive the constituent courses. Regarding what we do and why, are there alternatives for enhancing the utility of the program for the Directorate of Intelligence.

3. I believe there is a general congruence both on diagnosis of the problems and on prescriptions for improvement between the views of OTE course directors and those of outside authorities on policy and intelligence analysis. I believe the views of most DI managers are also generally similar, if at times articulated in different terms. Much more open to challenge, however, are the content, emphasis, number, and spacing of individual courses.

4. We will examine the New Analyst Course (NAC), Seminar on Intelligence Analysis (SIA), and Seminar on Intelligence Successes and Failures (ISF). We will make reference to "substitute" courses for the NAC (e.g., Intelligence Analysis Course) and to the new offerings on warning and deception. But at this stage, we probably will not examine these in detail.



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Status Report on an Evaluation Panel for Courses on  
the Analytical Process

5. Nearly all new DI hires (some 200 in 1985) take the NAC or a similar course, where the emphasis is on survival skills--the mechanics for effective conventional wisdom and products. About 90 analysts per year take the SIA (mostly after two to five years of experience), which exposes them to techniques for adding discipline and creativity to their assessments. And 50 to 60 experienced analysts and supervisors participate in the ISF, which examines DDI recommendations for overcoming a variety of problems, including strained policy relations.

#### Outside Panelists

6. Bob Jervis of Columbia and Dick Betts of Brookings have agreed to participate in the conference. Both have done impressive work on policy and intelligence analysis--especially in the areas of ambiguity and deception, misperception and bias, policy relations, and barriers to openmindedness and creativity.

7. Bob Dorn of the Center for Creative Leadership has also accepted, and will approach the problem from the vantage point of organizational psychology.

8. You want to add Graham Allison, which can be done either now or later; and the DDI may also wish to recommend an outside panelist.

#### Inside Panelists

9. The goal here is to get a mixture of managers, in effect our sponsors and "consumers," whose views can help us improve the effectiveness of our program and whose support can enhance its impact. Perhaps four or five inside panel members would be about right, though other interested managers could participate as observers.

- a. Dick Kerr
- b. Helene Boatner
- c.
- d. John Helgerson
- e.
- f.
- g.
- h.

10. After the DDI, Kerr and Boatner are the central figures in the relationship between analysis training and the Directorate. Since they are ultimately responsible for the

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Status Report on an Evaluation Panel for Courses on the Analytical Process

number and quality of course directors and students, they must have high confidence in the soundness of our courses. The other suggested panelists represent the Offices that send the bulk of the students, except for Scopelitis who may have special insights after her work on the IG Report on OTE.

### The Conference

11. The conference is scheduled for 25 June at Chamber of Commerce. My plans are as follows:

- a. Send the participants a pre-conference paper on the matters to be discussed;
- b. Table some classified information on numbers, syllabuses, and so forth;
- c. Hold three short sessions at which the directors of the individual courses provide additional information and answer questions;
- d. Give the outside participants (perhaps with the assistance of one inside panelist) 45 minutes to plan their critique and an hour to deliver it;
- e. Open the discussion to all participants;
- f. Conclude with a statement on the general sense of the meeting.

### Post-Conference Activities

- a. Draft a conference report addressed to D/OTE and DDI, to be reviewed by and issues in the name of the evaluation panel.
- b. Reconvene the panel for followup critiques once or twice a year.

### Outside Activities

12. Your goal of using the exercise as a model for other OTE evaluation panels could be advanced by:

- a. Inviting OTE division chiefs to participate in the conference as observers;

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Status Report on an Evaluation Panel for Courses on  
the Analytical Process

- b. After the conference, convening a session of the Curriculum Committee to review the process and the report.



25X1

CONFIDENTIAL